

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/733,444	SHAHER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Weilun Lo	3747	

**All Participants:**

(1) Weilun Lo.

(2) Mr. Clifford Crowder.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 27 June 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
n/a

Claims discussed:  
all

Prior art documents discussed:  
art of record, see PTO-892.

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Acknowledgment was made of the election of Species II, drawn to Fig. 3. Examiner indicated that original independent Claim 11 is allowable and is generic to Species II and III (Figs. 3 and 4). Therefore all claims drawn to Species II and III would be considered. Agreement was reached to more clearly define the elected invention by amending the remaining claims and canceling non-elected claims, drawn to Species I. Regarding dependent Claim 5, drawn to Species II and III, the examiner expressed the opinion that the claim is too broad due to the fact that there is not sufficient structural relationship to define the first and second manifold to overcome the art of record. Agreement was reached to cancel Claims 1-5 to expedite prosecution. See examiner's amendment.

The following remarks are from the applicants and are hereby acknowledged: Applicants expressly reserve the right to file a divisional application, consonant with the election of species requirement made in this application, containing claims to species I (Figs. 1-2) and generic claims embracing all species. Cancellation of generic claims and claims directed to species I (Figs. 1 and 2) is without prejudice to Applicants' right to file a divisional application and does not constitute an admission regarding patentability. To the contrary, Applicants intend to exercise their right to pursue the canceled claims by way of a divisional application under 35 U.S.C. 121. Applicants' agreement to the Examiner's Amendment has been made solely for efficiency of prosecution. Neither the number of independent or dependent claims is increased by this amendment. Accordingly, no fee is due. To the extent that any fee is necessary to process the amendment, it should be charged to deposit account 06-0916. .